TO: Neighborhood Planning Work Group
    Parking and Traffic Work Group
    Neighborhood Livability Work Group

FROM: Eric Adams, Project Manager

DATE: April 30, 2012

SUBJECT: Corvallis-OSU Collaboration Project – Compilation of Notes from the March 22, April 9, and April 24 Work Group Meetings

Below is a compilation of notes taken by facilitators during the work group meetings held on March 22, April 9, and April 24. These are presented for you to refer to during upcoming meetings scheduled between May and the end of August.

**Parking and Traffic**

*March 22 Meeting*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Traffic</th>
<th>Parking</th>
<th>Transit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cut-through traffic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street designations (function/? volume)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of cars</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing patterns</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment patterns</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak commute patterns</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hot spots in two-hour parking districts</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All-day parking “outside” districts</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of OSU Parking</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking enforcement</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine payment/collection</td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*April 9 Meeting*
• Students having cars
  o Policy
  o Practice
• Availability of parking
  o Where?
    o Open lots / paid permits
• Event parking – communication of where to park
• Extended parking district / new parking district
  o 9th to 14th Streets
  o Monroe to Harrison
• Parking district around Senior Center – support events/functions at Center
• Additional parking districts
  o Managing shift of parking within and around districts
    ▪ How to expand or dissolve districts
• Comprehensive management strategy
• Support for parking districts
  o Number of cars for household within parking districts
    ▪ Also for new construction – is required enough?
• University shuttle system
  o Use as a tool to manage parking
    ▪ Headway/frequency/communication
  o Interface with CTS
• Campus practice of having new development on parking lots
• North-south connection (e.g., 26th street)
• East-west connection (e.g., Washington Way)
• Neighborhood streets used by cut-through traffic
  o Traffic patterns
• Code enforcement
  o Parking and livability – combine resources for parking and livability
• Funding of enforcement
  o Increased number of enforcement and management as parking districts expand or
    if new ones are created.
• Pedestrian safety using roads
  o Shared use
  o Multi-modal
• Additional bicycle parking spaces on campus
• Using transit as a tool to assist with parking and traffic (transportation)
  o In and out of campus
  o Campus to downtown

April 24 Meeting

• Could lot at Reser Stadium be free for students and faculty?
The distance from lots on south side of campus to the campus core is the same as that from neighborhoods on the north side.

The number of parking permits issued in the residential parking districts north of campus is based on the number of kitchens within a dwelling unit. (Need to confirm)

Is it possible for a shuttle service to be established to transport students and faculty from nearby towns (e.g., Philomath, Albany, Lebanon)?

There is an established perception that every student living in off-campus housing has a car, resulting in saturation of on-street parking within neighborhoods surrounding campus.

Cars are often parked inefficiently along streets, further reducing the potential for on-street parking.

On-street parking is used so much that leaf pick-up in the fall is difficult.

Could OSU establish a 15-minute shuttle between the parking lot at the Benton Fairgrounds and the campus core, traveling along Campus Way?

Parking structures on the north and east of campus boundary are needed; need to be free to encourage use. Could have ground floor office/classroom space.

Is there actually enough curbside parking available within the various parking districts to accommodate the number of permits issued, or are they oversold?

There are “hot spots” within the existing parking districts where utilization exceeds 85%.

Traffic volume within neighborhoods surrounding the campus is significantly impacted by drivers “trolling” for parking spaces during specific periods of the day.

Anecdotal evidence of approximately 300-400 cars per day traveling along NW 36th Street.

Vehicle speeds along NW 36th Street appear to be frequently in excess of the 25mph speed limit.

Parking demand ratios for multifamily housing need to be revisited.

Parking impacts within neighborhoods near campus appear to be closely tied to class times.

The use of parking meters might be more effective in high density residential zones.

Replacement parking spaces provided as a result of new development on campus might not always be comparable in terms of location and convenience.

Entries to residential neighborhoods need to be emphasized to discourage cut-through traffic. Wayfinding signage?

What potential exists for using photo-enforced radar and/or other traffic calming tools?

There is a significant concern over pedestrian safety at intersections without marked crosswalks.

Accountability among all transportation modes needs to be emphasized and reinforced.

There are sometimes unintended consequences of implementing traffic calming measures; can force traffic into new areas.

In order to be a viable alternative to cars, the transit system should operate at a service level such that no one has to wait longer than 15 minutes at a stop.

More education is needed to teach motorists and cyclists how to share the road and drive/ride responsibly.

More covered bike parking is needed on and near campus.
• A car share program might encourage students to leave vehicles at home so they don’t have to bring a private car to Corvallis just so they can travel home or outside of Corvallis.
• Extending a sidewalk/multiuse path along NW Harrison Blvd. to the Circle Blvd. extension might encourage more people to walk to campus from the Witham Hill area.
• Could OSU offer a tuition discount for students who don’t bring cars to Corvallis?
• Remember that students and faculty are experiencing their own frustrations with parking and traffic.

**Neighborhood Livability**

**March 22 Meeting**

• Police data on citations (locations and frequency)
• Party registration? Yes, through Fire Dept., at least for Greek community
• Role of diversity in standards
• Create goals
• Hear all point of view, gather info in multiple formats
• Univ. Nebraska/Lincoln as a model?
• Role of campus housing and spill-over into neighborhoods
• What are needs of students on campus?
• Conversation and police ride-alongs
• May 18 pub stroll
• Communication strategies
• What does university think their role is in neighborhoods? Community’s role?
• City ombudsperson

**April 9 Meeting**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excessive noise at 2a.m.</td>
<td>Uninterrupted sleep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol abuse</td>
<td>Reduce impact of alcohol on neighborhoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing tenure</td>
<td>Mixture of rental/home ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student orientation</td>
<td>Community expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of term garbage (e.g., couches, glass in street)</td>
<td>Recycling/landlord assistance, street sweeping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help/hotline numbers</td>
<td>Communication plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street lighting</td>
<td>More lights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density-housing</td>
<td>Plan for closer in? OSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better OSU/community communication</td>
<td>More student interaction (e.g., IFC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior issues are outliers</td>
<td>Students required to live on campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property up-keep</td>
<td>More regulations/landlord licenses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student awareness</td>
<td>Better communication (e.g., Facebook)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment management</td>
<td>On-site property manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Party Houses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Permanent residents reaching out

Ongoing program to re-energize

Intentional mixing, e.g., BBQs at OSU

Ownership/consequences

### Lack of knowledge by neighborhoods

Better resource info. – standards

Consistent message

Real-time info share – website

### Noisy events on campus

CPD/OSU Campus PD coordination

OSU/City point of contacts

### Noise

City noise enforcement

### General issues

Greater police presence

Proactive livability/enforcement programs

### Garbage/trash cans

OSU program to outreach to off-campus students

Off-campus conduct reports to OSU student conduct office

### Solutions:

- OSU provide money to City for livability/enforcement and other services?
  - Payment in lieu of taxes
  - Utility fees
- Make students feel part of Corvallis
- Landlord accountability standards for tenants
- Call owners of disruptive properties/tenants
- Escalating penalties
- Neighborhood communication/civility
- Better identification of landlords and landlord/parents
- Affordable on-campus housing options

### April 24 Meeting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protection of children – diversity, awareness, neighborhood safety</td>
<td>- Place to report and track issues (bias response team)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise – spring/fall (music amplification) Chronic nuisance (helped??)</td>
<td>- Better enforcement of ordinance - speedier action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landlord accountability standards for tenants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call owners of disruptive properties/tenants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escalating penalties</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood communication/civility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better identification of landlords and landlord/parents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable on-campus housing options</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Neighborhood Planning

**March 22 Meeting**

- Mix of densitites within a neighborhood.
- Design standards
  - Townhouses-multifamily
    - Mass – size
    - Mass – numbers
- University areas
  - RS-20(U) plus possible higher density (e.g., 35-40 units per acre) zones
- Compatibility issues with varied densities closely adjacent in a single family neighborhood.
- Look at comp. standards for transition areas
- Need to consider longer term history re: a neighborhood’s redevelopment history since 1970’s era.
- Look at Portland infill standards and graphics
- Consider historic design patterns of an area when developing design standards
- Inventories of baseline information: what are neighborhoods like now?
- Other tools neighborhood groups could use to preserve their neighborhoods architecturally (e.g., “conservation/preservation” easements).
- Question: Major zone changes may necessitate a review of parts of the Comp. Plan. What is the tipping point in those amounts? Also may need to be considered for Transportation Plan and possible parking effects.
- Examine range of units allowed within a …
- Explore public/private partnerships for OSU like those done at UC Davis, other Oregon universities.
- How to mitigate costs of development on campus for the types of living arrangements students prefer?
- Require all freshman to live on campus.
- Land Development Code (LDC) standards for housing units leased per bedroom.
- LDC standards that inhibit good design and/or improvements to existing development.
- Adopt Infill Task Force Report.
- Standards needed to further facilitate and improve infill development.
- Survey of existing neighborhoods to ascertain relevant design elements.
- Encourage/require students to not bring cars to campus.
- Conflicting standards/values, etc. for parking.
- Consider target areas w/different parking standards.
- “No-car” apartments.

**April 9 Meeting**

- Move project boundary north to Circle Blvd.; pick up NW corner at Grant and 35th.
- Feel threatened by townhouse development.
  - Impact to investment, property values
  - Livability is reduced
  - Density is concerning
- Student-oriented designs create concentrated impacts vs. broader multifamily designs
- Consider downsizing some of these areas
  - Density could go onto campus and out further on bus routes
  - Down zoning impacts setbacks, heights
  - How to deal with impacts to property values (downzoning?)
- “Takings” concerns not warranted because “reasonable use” still allowed.
- Is parking the biggest issue?
• Conflict between RS-20 zone and historic districts
• 4-5 bedroom units only work for students, don’t serve families
• Look at Stanford model – mixed residency unit types
• Impacts are being felt between Grant and Circle – rentals are going to students due to high cost.
• Suggest expanding study area boundary
• What is potential for densification in College Hill West Historic District?
• Need to keep a mix – not “monoculture” populations
• Skip Wentz (sp?) suggestion – put students on or near campus, not on outskirts of town.
• Seek grant money for housing provision – public money
• Consider infill design guidelines
• Consider no-car apartments near campus, with strong enforcement mechanism
• Parking provision needs to be impact neutral
• Reduce number of unrelated adults allowed within a dwelling unit
• Do property values fall in neighborhoods with redevelopment?
• Are there vacancies in the dorms (Yes)
  o Consider measures to make on-campus housing more attractive to renters/students
• What is mix of on-campus housing? Two-thirds are double-loaded corridors
• Possible to offer vacant rooms without meal plans?
• Require freshman to live on campus
• Kids want to move off campus because they can’t cook their own food in dorms
• Why do students lease on-campus housing? #1, price; #2 independence.
• Where are new students coming from?
  o Projections flat for first-year students
  o Second-year students, transfers from community college and veterans coming back to school increasing – more special needs students (autism, etc.)
• Rents pricing out of affordability
  o Reducing allowable number of unrelated residents would move cost of housing towards affordable level.
• There is a need [housing??] that will be accommodated somewhere
• Need historic preservation plan to determine what to preserve, what to redevelop, etc.
• How do we attract families to our community? Not just students.
• Focus only on density near OSU, diversity losses (families, retirees) in these areas.
• How to evaluate impacts of multiple developments occurring at once?
• What is the appropriate mix of housing types to promote/sustain livability?
• What is amount of land available for housing on campus? OSU doesn’t have a precise allocation, but plans by sector.
• Retirees will be relocating from single family dwellings (downsizing), but where will they go to if most townhomes/apartments are occupied by students that can afford to pay higher rents?
• South Central Park a good model for a neighborhood with a mix that is livable.
• What is threshold of student rentals that equates to a loss/”tipping point” of livability? 15%, 20%, 30%, 50%??
• Students have a tenuous connection to the community.
• Substandard housing contributing to demand for new student housing – older properties not maintained, rundown, then redeveloped.
• Municipal court site a waste of land and a prime site for redevelopment of multifamily mixed use. Park Place a good example.
• Student housing at Witham Oaks may have greater transportation impacts
• Pay greater attention to corridors, such as Harrison and Van Buren
• Students do better in mixed neighborhoods – make better neighbors
• Unintended consequences of state mandate for density
• South Central Park is one of the most endangered neighborhoods in the community
• Need for data on amount of under-utilized properties (with good potential for redevelopment).
• If limit was reduced to three unrelated individuals, would it result in more tear-downs?
• Some of these neighborhoods define the character of Corvallis
• Inventory of existing housing would be useful for this process
• Is OSU growth something we must accept?
• SW corner of Van Buren and 23rd – should be a model for good redevelopment
• Development done by folks out of town – can we require in-town developers?
• Promote transit, bike, pedestrian usage by students
• Park and Ride for students to long-term park their cars (accessed by transit)
• Spread solution out through the whole City – calls for better transit etc. a way to start addressing Peak Oil, global warming.

April 24 Meeting

• Consider routing construction traffic only on main roads.
• OSU should pay for a code enforcement program (at least one position).
• Make tenants and landlords accountable for violations; graduated penalties is a good idea.
• Rezone neighborhoods near OSU to low density – single family dwellings.
• Reconsider the number of unrelated persons allowed to live in the same dwelling unit; should be reduced.
• The gradual decline of families with children is a concern in these neighborhoods.
• There has been a reduction of affordable housing in neighborhoods surrounding the OSU campus.
• Design standards may be used to enhance compatibility.
• Limit the amount of rental units in a neighborhood – tax on rental units could be a disincentive.
• Require one off-street parking space per bedroom.
• Balance parking with amount of pavement on a site.
• Need to be aware of potential occupancy per bedroom.
• Consistent, recent trend is “tear downs” resulting in much higher density.
• Concern over demolition of historic homes.
• The City’s long range planner position should be funded.
• The terms “open space” and “green space” need to be redefined to make a clear distinction.
• Is there a way to address “demolition by neglect?”
• There is a concern about the quality of rental housing; needs monitoring.
• City could charge an annual fee to landlords to fund inspections.
• Tighter regulation of the number of unrelated occupants living in a dwelling is needed.
• The trend of individually rented rooms may lead to less accountability.
• OSU needs to accommodate its students’ housing needs on campus.
• A lack of affordable housing is a problem for students.
• Accessory dwelling units are a better model for students than large multifamily projects.
• There should be a moratorium on “tear downs” until a change (?) is made.
• Can OSU limit enrollment growth?
• A design charrette may benefit neighborhoods in working to develop design standards – could OSU help to support design charrettes?
• Neighborhood-specific charrette process has good potential – need incentives.
• Students can be engaged in helping to solve some of these problems.
• Need to acknowledge diversity of student body – the needs/wants of a 19 year old are different from a grad student.
• Good to require freshman (maybe even sophomores) to live on campus.
• Concern that this process will take so long that “the battle will be lost.”
• Finding new places for student housing may reduce problems and conflicts.
• There is a feeling that developers are in control.
• High percentage of students living in rental housing makes it difficult for local businesses to “survive” summer.
• There is the potential for development code changes to get tied up in appeals, just like 2000 LDC amendments.
• Student orientation should touch on obligations of living in a community, and/or include parents – for example, “on-the-ground” contact.
• OSU could have a community liaison or ombudsman.
• Could consider neighborhood bill of rights ordinance or similar measure.
• Annual block party concept helps to build ties, like Cal Poly San Luis Obispo.
• Need to settle up on what we want to accomplish – what is desired state of neighborhoods?
• What can OSU do to help?
• How can we spread growth throughout the community?